

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 11

January 18, 1943

WHOLE NO. 962

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE

If History Repeats Itself Again (*McKinlay*); The Gospel of John and Modern Greek (*Gingrich*)

REVIEWS

CORNFORD, Republic of Plato (*De Lacy*); SCHLAUCH, *Aspects of* Tongues (*Hulley*); RICHTER, Roman Portraits (*Comfort*); HART, *Lejeune*, Latin Key to Better English (*Santee*); GODOLPHIN, Greek Historians (*Harrer*); DAY, Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination (*Dow*); ZACHARIADES, Tübingen und Konstantinopel (*Taeubler*); THOMAS, Selections Illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics 2 (*Stahl*)

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

Ready Soon--

Fifteen Greek Plays

Translated by GILBERT MURRAY and others

Selected and edited by LANE COOPER

Professor Cooper's famous collection, *Ten Greek Plays*, now in its seventh printing, has been revised and expanded to include a larger and more representative selection from the dramatists. It has been a widely adopted text for the study of the classics in translation and of comparative literature. The new edition will be greatly increased in value and will be welcomed by both teacher and student, as well as by the vast number of general readers who study Greek drama for enjoyment.

Oxford UNIVERSITY PRESS - - 114 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE

If History Repeats Itself Again—

Around one thousand B.C. a mechanized unit of Nordics came down from the Northland and fell upon the eastern end of the Mediterranean. This region, roughly embracing the Aegean Sea, had centuries before been organized into more of an economic and political unit than it has been at any time since. (Under Rome it was not an integrated unit but only a part of a greater whole.) These newcomers had learned to use steel. The possessors had only bronze. The steel wielders easily overcame their victims.

Of the succeeding course of events we know little. It is to be presumed that the victors would want to cash in on the fruits of their victories. There is some evidence that they attempted to organize things on something like a helot basis. At least that is what we find among the descendants of these Dorians centuries later. Suffice it to say that as an economic and political venture the move was a failure. Great cities disappeared as if by magic and culture went into the abyss of oblivion so that for hundreds of years there was a blackout of far greater intensity than that which followed the fall of Rome. People went on living in a small way. There would be islanders living off goats and gardens unless pirates came along and cleaned them out. There were no doubt multitudinous units of trivial import but as any sort of functioning state the Aegean basin was no more.

Out of this blackness came one ray of light. It was Homer and his epics. We know little of their provenience, but they caught the imagination of later ages. Homer was the poet by whom all others were to be rated. In fact men came to think of a poet as the creator par excellence; for the *t* of the word *poet* (-*της*) means 'one who' and the rest of the word means 'make(s)' and in the word *poem* the *m* (-*μα*) means 'the result of', so that a poem is merely what comes out of working.

As we contemplate the future and realize what the

"come across" attitude of foreign fuehrers and of domestic labor lords may result in, and, seeing with the eye of historical inexorability, we vision a complete blackout of western culture, with a bit of it surviving, perhaps, in China, we are led to ask, "When this turn of the round of Fate comes with centuries of a dark age to consummate the deletion of the past; and if there should be, like the work of Homer, some one thing to come out of the dark, will the thing that most impresses the new generations as the symbol of what is most worthwhile be a work of art or some so-called modern exemplification of working in steel, such as an airplane or tank?"

ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

The Gospel of John and Modern Greek

It is common knowledge that the *κοινή* Greek in general, and the Greek of the New Testament in particular, is midway between the pure Attic of classical times and Modern Greek. While this can be demonstrated from almost any part of the New Testament, there are several examples from the gospel of John which may have especial significance.

In classical Greek, *πάγω* is nearly always transitive, but in the New Testament it is always intransitive, with the meaning 'to go away' or simply 'to go.' The author of John's gospel uses it oftener than any other New Testament writer. He employs the word in all its ordinary shades of meaning, and in addition appropriates it as a sort of technical term used of Jesus' going to the Father (cf. 7:33, 13:3, 16:5, 10 et al.). In Modern Greek the word means 'to go' and is one of the commonest verbs in the language; it is shortened to *πάω* or *πάγω*, and is found also in the lengthened form *πηγαίνω*, which is based on the late aorist *ἤπηγα*.

At first *τρώγω* meant 'to nibble, gnaw' and was gradually generalized in meaning until in Herodotus it

included human eating. In *κοινή* it makes considerable headway against the older and more respectable *ἐσθίω*. The New Testament has it six times, five of which are in John. Four of John's five uses are in 6:54, 56-8, where the author again uses it in a specialized sense with reference to the Eucharist. In Modern Greek *τρώγω* has driven *ἐσθίω* from colloquial speech, and is shortened to *τρώω*.

One of the many diminutives of *κοινή* is *ὀψάριον* (from *ὀψον*); at first it meant simply 'something cooked,' then a 'relish' or something eaten with bread, and it was finally restricted to 'cooked fish.' John is the only New Testament writer who uses the word (6:9, 11; 21:9, 10, 13). In colloquial Modern Greek it has replaced *ἰχθύς* altogether, and it has been generalized to mean 'fish' whether on the table or in the water; it is shortened to *ψάρι*.

The colloquial Modern Greek for 'bread' is *ψωμί*, not *ἄρτος*. Like *ὀψάριον*, *ψωμίον* is a late diminutive which meant a 'crumb' or, better, 'piece of bread.' John alone uses it in the New Testament (13:26, 27, 30).

The similarity of John's Greek to Modern Greek is by no means limited to the vocabulary. In the modern form of the language, the infinitive has been replaced by *νά* (*iva*) and the subjunctive, a phenomenon often found in John, e.g. 8:56; 11:53; 12:10. The first and third person polite imperatives in Modern Greek are formed with *ἄς* (*ἄφες*) as an auxiliary; although John has no examples of *ἄφες* with the first person (see Matthew 7:4), it is found with the third person in an interesting construction with *iva* in 12:7.

F. W. GINGRICH

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE

REVIEWS

The Republic of Plato. Translated with Introduction and Notes by FRANCIS MACDONALD CORNFORD. xxvii, 356 pages. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1941

The most distinctive feature of this new translation of the Republic is that it breaks up the dialogue into "Parts" and "Chapters" and abandons the traditional division into books. The translator finds that there are forty chapters, which fall under six parts. At the beginning of each of his divisions of the Republic he has inserted a brief analysis of what is to follow. He has also provided an Introduction of fifteen pages on Plato's life and works. The numerous footnotes and the analytical index at the end of the book afford further help to the reader in understanding and interpreting the text.

Professor Cornford's translation is, in fact, not a mere translation; it is an interpretation as well. The Preface states that it is the purpose of the work not to make a literal translation, but to convey to "the English reader as much as possible of the thought of the *Republic* in the most convenient and least misleading form." In his search for the most convenient and least misleading form the translator has found it necessary to make many alterations in the text of Plato, and often to paraphrase rather than to translate.

The division of the work into Parts and Chapters, which seems to me quite helpful, is a comparatively superficial alteration. Much bolder are the changes in the dialogue itself. The translator finds Plato's "dialectic" tedious and obscure. He has therefore reduced greatly the number of questions and answers by compressing into a few declarative sentences a passage which appears in the original as a long sequence of questions and answers. On page 37, for example, Professor Cornford has reduced to four rather involved sentences, of

which only one is interrogative, a series of eight sentences, of which all but one are questions. He has in the same passage reduced the number of responses from eight to three. It appears that for the translator the Platonic dialectic, which aims by so-called "Socratic induction" to lead the person interrogated to the discovery of new truth, is not an indispensable element in Plato's writings.

The translator quite rightly refuses to limit himself to a single English equivalent for such Greek words as *δίκαιος* and *ἀρετή*. He is careful to explain in such cases the different meanings of the Greek word and the best means of translating them into English. Such explanations appear in the short analytical passages inserted by the translator at the division points of the text, as for example on pages 29 and 176.

A few short passages have been omitted entirely from the translation. In such cases the translator has mentioned the fact and given his reasons. The longest omission, I believe, is that mentioned on page 32.

Although Professor Cornford in the Preface disclaims any attempt to attack or defend Plato's opinions, he gives many hints throughout the work that are intended to help the reader evaluate the arguments. On page 8, for example, he provides the reader with a general principle which will make more plausible Plato's analogy between moral conduct and the arts. On pages 35-6 he quotes Nettleship's attempt to bolster up Plato's rather unconvincing transition from virtue to happiness at the end of Book I. There is no comment, however, on Plato's treatment of predication at the end of Book V.

Professor Cornford's concern with the problem of Plato's significance for the modern world is evident at many points. Indeed, this concern provides the key to his work. He has tried to emphasize those aspects of Plato's thought which, in his opinion, are most profit-

able for study today, and to minimize those passages that would be unacceptable to a modern reader. He qualifies Plato's criticism of art (pages 314-5); he carefully points out that the criticism of democracy in Book VIII does not apply to modern democracy (page 273); he absolves Plato's guardians of promiscuity (page 152); he notes the difference between Plato's "noble lie" (a phrase which he wisely rejects) and modern propaganda (pages 103-4); he finds even in the Myth of Er a symbolic meaning which anyone can accept as true (page 342). If these comments, which are not so numerous as to be obtrusive, succeed in making Plato more acceptable to modern readers, perhaps they are justified.

PHILLIP DE LACY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Gift of Tongues. By MARGARET SCHLAUCH. ix, 342 pages, end-paper maps. Modern Age Books, New York 1942 \$3.50

Intended as a popularized introduction to the study of general linguistics, *The Gift of Tongues* was written, as Professor Schlauch states in her preface, for the "educated reader with an unprofessional, merely casual interest in language" and "represents an attempt . . . to find the middle ground" between the extremes which characterize so-called popular treatments of linguistics—namely, superficiality and excessive technicality.

On the whole, the work of Professor Schlauch may be said to achieve its purpose, for it offers the general reader much that is important and instructive, presented in readable form. Yet the process of finding "the middle ground" involves a selection of materials which is likely to be quite subjective; and what one person may choose to omit, another may think should be included. For example, the account of speech-sounds (19ff.) gives scant attention to the physiological mechanism by which these sounds are produced; the account of changes in the sounds of vowels (179ff.) makes no mention of qualitative changes. Again, the list of IE consonants (188) contains no reference to the labiovelars. The effort to popularize, too, seems to be a conscious one, rather unevenly maintained. As a result, the style is marked at times by slang expressions like *hop*—a short trip—(48) or "clicks" (170); at times by artificial usages like *arachnid* (116) or *analphabetism* (258). Similarly the method of presenting the subject-matter seems at times unnecessarily elementary, as when an imaginary trip around the world is made a device for carrying the discussion of language families, or a trip to Cuba is used to introduce an account of sound-shifts.

In its scope, the work is comprehensive and brings before the reader not only such material as may be expected in an introduction to general linguistics—

sounds, sound-shifts, development of alphabets, word-formation, syntax—but also certain aspects of linguistics which may at times be neglected. The chapter on Language and Poetic Creation should be commended for suggestions that will prove valuable in the aesthetic appreciation of poetry. So too the chapter on Social Aspects: Class, Taboos, Politics for its suggestion of the sociological influences affecting language. The attitude exhibited in the chapter dealing with semantics seems sane and well taken, for in addition to her discussion of semantics from a linguistic point of view, Professor Schlauch gives a timely warning against the excessive claims of popular semanticists. The chapter devoted to an historical account of the English language is adequate for its purpose, and appropriate in a volume addressed, as it seems, to readers interested primarily in English.

The appendix of the book contains three sections. The first is a combination of Bibliography and Notes, presented chapter by chapter. There are certain advantages in compiling a bibliography for each chapter, but they are somewhat offset in this volume by the fact that the titles are obscured in a running commentary which includes the notes on each chapter (given without numerical reference to the text). The second part, entitled *Diversions and Illustrations*, offers material on which readers may try their hand at applying the principles discussed in each chapter. This material is in general well chosen for both instructiveness and interest; some of it, moreover, is intended to stimulate reading in other works on linguistics. The third section consists of a list of the English words dealt with in the book. A general index concludes the volume.

In many of its details, the book is marred by misleading statements, the results perhaps of compression, and by errors, of which the following list is representative. The statement that "Latin modified P to R, Σ to S, Δ to D" and that "The Romans . . . used H for a new purpose (simple aspiration)" (40) is erroneous. There is no reason for starring the Latin verb *specere* (89, 91). A list of words introduced into English from Arabic sources is given (97-8) without an explanation that they are not all unquestionably Arabic: e.g., *almanac*, *almagest*; or that *alcohol* did not mean in Arabic what it means to present-day English readers. The statement regarding the ending -s in the singular of English verbs (137) is not clearly put and could be misleading to readers, save for their own knowledge of English verb-forms. The reference to the Greek aorist as "the Greek 'indefinite past' tense" which "meant a definite time" (152) is not only inadequate but also inaccurate. "Wanna" (for "want to") is not an example of anticipatory assimilation (172). E. "'chamber' from *camara*" (better L. *camera*) is not strictly an example of dissimilation (186). L. *proponere* does not mean to "place under" (232). L. *delinquere* does not mean to be

"left behind", nor is it the source of *E. derelict* (233).

Typographical errors are not numerous. Here and there errors occur in the phonetic symbols. A few examples of other misprints may be mentioned: 189, n. 6, a reference to n. 4 should read n. 5; 190, n. 7, for "Greek *legere*" read *legein*; 201, for *unica* read *uncia*; 235, for *three* read *thee*.

KARL K. HULLEY

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Roman Portraits I. A Picture Book. 4 pages, 51 figures on 20 plates. **Roman Portraits II.** A Picture Book. 4 pages, 64 figures on 20 plates. [By GISELA M. A. RICHTER.] Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 1941 \$0.25 each

"The Metropolitan Museum owns a valuable collection of Roman portraits—some sixty statues, busts and heads, mostly in marble and bronze, both in the round and in relief. They are herewith introduced to the public in two picture books, the first comprising examples dating from the Republic to the Flavian Age; the second, those from Trajan to Constantine. The whole development of Roman portraiture is represented in these two series."

No other American museum caters to the intelligent curiosity and interest of the laity as cooperatively as does the Metropolitan. Miss Richter's picture books of Roman Portraits fall into a large series for the common touch designed not only to place in non-specialist hands a comprehensible account of the Museum's treasures but also to ensure its emanation from the most expert and authoritative pens. Metropolitan Museum popular publications may sometimes bore their authors as routine small change, but the public recognizes and appreciates the gold standard.

The casual visitor, and even the classicist, usually gives scant attention to the battered and fragmentary heads in the classical galleries; if he regards them as anything more than a touch of atrium atmosphere before passing on to something more spectacular, he merely glances at the printed cards beneath. Miss Richter deserves gratitude for bringing the whole collection together into a more meaningful form which can be carried away, enjoyed and absorbed at leisure. Even those most familiar with the collection will make some new acquaintances.

To each pamphlet of twenty plates Miss Richter prefixes four pages of helpful general introductory commentary combining allusions to political history, general observations of sculptural periods, and notes on individual portraits. There are neither footnotes nor bibliography, and no parallels from other museums or from other arts such as painting and numismatics are illustrated or even cited. Even the appearance of pedantry is rigorously (and wisely) excluded from the text.

On the other hand, the essential subject matter, the photographs, are outstanding in quality and quantity. The public rarely receives such value for two bits. Every free-standing head except two, and several of the reliefs, are shown in both profile and full-face. Even though two, or more usually four, cuts stand upon each page, the details of execution and texture appear with remarkable clarity and vividness.

Miss Richter very rightly relates the phenomena of creative art to the phenomena of contemporary politics and society, e.g. "a new sense of animation is observable [in the third century], perhaps reflecting the restlessness of the time." Her Flexner Lectures at Bryn Mawr last year included brilliant expositions of a similar relationship of cause and effect. Yet this reviewer wonders whether in thus emphasizing the background of the sculptor and his handiwork there is not a danger of losing the sculptor himself. In a certain sense of course he was an impersonally fated product of his age, but even though we can discern larger causes of which he himself was unaware, he must also have had a plan and a theory which he believed to be peculiarly his own. Without loss of necessary background, a slight shift of emphasis could have clarified to the reader not merely why fashions in sculpture changed but also what the sculptor visualized himself as doing and what problems he thought he was solving. Miss Richter has a flair for identifying herself with the ancient craftsmen whose work she discusses, and in this case one wishes that space had allowed her a little more freedom to indulge it. Museum statuary is chilly stuff at best; interpretations which identify it with the personality of its creators correspondingly endear it to the man in the street.

HOWARD COMFORT

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

The Latin Key to Better English. By ARCHIBALD HART and F. ARNOLD LEJEUNE. 226 pages. Dutton, New York 1942 \$2

The other day I heard a girl say: "He paid me the supreme compliment. He said I was exotic." Soon afterward I was asked by a friend how I liked his date. "I think she's exotic," I replied hopefully. But the result was far from what I had anticipated. Others may differ with me, but I am convinced that the two girls disagreed not in the qualities they liked or disliked, but in their interpretation of the word 'exotic'. And I have little doubt now that both of them were wrong.

A language of many words is of little use when the meanings of the words are not anchored. Words of a living language should drift a little, but when Latin and Greek were forgotten the cables were cut. The resulting inconsistency and confusion may be a cause of the

recent agitation for a universal language with limited vocabulary such as Basic English.

The authors pitilessly remind us that many intelligent people have missed Latin in their schooling. I have never felt charitable toward such people, but, since I have to live among them, I recognize their existence as a problem. In a technical and mercantile age their opinions have weight and they can pose as educated people. If we do nothing about them, they may do things to us. Therefore it becomes necessary to talk with them. But it is impossible to talk with them. The meanings they attach to words show too great individual variation. They seem to be viewing the same thing with opposite emotions until it becomes clear that they are only ascribing opposite meanings to the same word.

This is the group of people Hart and Lejeune are trying to reach. They call their book "a practical guide to the more effective reading, writing, and speaking of English for those who have never studied Latin, as well as for those who did, but have forgotten it." They combine the learned playfulness of Poteat, the eye-catching argument of billboard advertising and the ingenuity of the most approved parlor games. Each of the 230 sections has at the top in bold type its number, a Latin word, often in several forms, and the English meanings. Beneath are its English derivatives incorporated in sentences which define and illustrate them. Last of all come a few derivatives not so illustrated. Sometimes a note is appended which calls attention to the spelling of the Latin word as an aid to the spelling of its derivatives. The 230 sections are neatly divided into 14 chapters. The first chapter deals with 20 prefixes. The next five deal with the 50 most important Latin words arranged alphabetically; the next eight with 160 less important Latin words also arranged alphabetically. Chapter 15 lists about 200 additional Latin words with English meanings and derivatives, but without illustrative sentences. At the beginning of each chapter is a series of a dozen questions and thought-provoking statements resembling conundrums.

Why is a deciduous tree like a decadent young man?

Would you expect a self-respecting spectre to be visible or invisible?

Why would a deaf child be handicapped in rendering obedience to its parents?

The sentences illustrating the derivatives also have smart epigrammatic turns.

If strangers attempt to *induce* you to enter a game of cards with them, do not be *taken in*.

When a suitor asks a wealthy girl to marry him, he possibly *implies* that he loves her. He is unlikely to say *explicitly*, even if it is true, that he is after her money.

This is the tone of the book. Although there are no errors, the authors do not shrink from equating somewhat sophistically the derivative of a Latin word with the translation of its parts. In one of the examples above, 'take in' does translate the parts of *induco*, but in the

slang sense in which it is used here it is not equal to 'induce' at all. Instances of this sort are not faults in a book intended for the general public. The authors are overly apologetic and somewhat fearful of shocking Latin scholars. We miss the mellow scholarship of such a book as E. L. Johnson's *Latin Words of Common English* (Heath, Boston 1931), where derivatives are classified according to the time and the way in which they reached English and historical notes inform us about the states of transition. But the sacrifice of accuracy to make a point stick, the revelation of a part truth as if it were the whole truth are good pedagogy for use with beginners.

FREDERICK L. SANTEE

KENYON COLLEGE

The Greek Historians. The complete and unabridged historical works of Herodotus (translated by George Rawlinson), Thucydides (translated by Benjamin Jowett), Xenophon (translated by Henry G. Dakyns), Arrian (translated by Edward J. Chinnock). Edited, with an introduction, revisions and additional notes, by FRANCIS R. B. GODOLPHIN. Volume 1: xxxviii, 1001 pages; Volume 2: iv, 964 pages. Random House, New York 1941 \$6

Professor Godolphin offers even more than the title-page indicates, for in the second volume he has reprinted in some 150 pages The Behistun Inscription of Darius (Rawlinson), The Constitution of the Athenians (Dakyns), Xenophon's Ways and Means (Dakyns), Xenophon's The Constitution of the Spartans (Dakyns), Aristotle's The Constitution of Athens (F. G. Kenyon), Arrian's The Indica (Chinnock). There are also brief sections devoted to Coinage and Purchasing Power, Measures and Distances, and a Glossary (rather short). Full indices, giving names and subjects, appear separately for Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon's Anabasis and Hellenica, Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander. A short Selected Bibliography (I xxxviii) gives references to text editions and other works, but not to other translations. A useful Introduction will help the uninitiated to acquire something of a unified conception of the course of Greek history and some understanding of the historians who wrote it.

In preparing these volumes, so extensive and so comprehensive and at so moderate a price, Professor Godolphin has done a real service. In his Preface he states that he has not merely reprinted the standard translations, but has corrected errors, has filled in passages of Herodotus omitted by Rawlinson, and has tried "in certain cases to bring the translation somewhat more into accord with the tone of the original." An examination of his text bears out his statements, and shows that an enormous amount of work has been done

in re-reading the translations with Greek texts, and in making changes.

It remains for the reviewer to illustrate by sampling types of changes made, and to point to some passages where vocabulary and phraseology remain unchanged. In Herodotus VII 8-9 I notice "spake" changed to "spoke." "Never yet, as our old men assure me, has our race reposed itself, since the time when Cyrus overcame Astyages, and so we Persians wrested the sceptre from the Medes" is unchanged; "And truly I have pondered upon this" left unchanged; "I may make known to you what I design to do. My intent is . . ." is left the same; "ye" altered to "you"; "The nations whereof I have spoken" unchanged; "When I announce the time for the army to meet together, hasten to the muster with a good will" same text; "Xerxes, having so spoken, held his peace. Whereupon Mardonius took the word, and said" same text; "you surpass" altered from "thou dost surpass"; "you have now uttered" altered from "thou hast now uttered"; "your resolve" altered from "thy resolve." These illustrations appear in the course of two successive chapters. The changes made are per se good; but the wording retained makes one wonder whether the changes go far enough.

Fewer changes have been made in Jowett's Thucydides. In I 1 I notice the spelling "enquiry," and in II 35 and II 41, "honour," "honoured" and "valour." The obvious changes were made in an American edition of the Jowett translation by A. P. Peabody some sixty years ago. In II 7 "barbarians" is a correction for "barbarian potentates." In II 34 "stage" is altered to "platform." In II 35 "when the deed is beyond him" is an improvement on "when the speaker rises above him." Similar changes had been made in C. F. Smith's Loeb translation. A good deal of somewhat stilted English is retained, e.g. in II 38 "The style of our life is refined"; II 40 "To avow poverty with us is no disgrace"; II 46 "their children should be maintained at the public charge"; II 47 "A similar disorder is said to have previously smitten many places."

In the Xenophon too a good deal of "old-fashioned" English is still to be read, though many passages are altered and corrected. Hellenica I 1 reads: "Hither also Alcibiades repaired from Clazomenae," and "addressing the men in terms of encouragement." In this latter passage excessive verbiage of the Dakyns translation has not been eliminated. C. T. Brownson in the Loeb has here done better, though I notice that he too has his difficulties, e.g. "And when the Athenian day-watcher descried him." Dakyns' *Anabasis* is handled in the same way as the other works. In III 1 "on every side environing them" is changed to "on every side about them"; "never expected to look upon again" becomes "never expected to see again"; "in that host" is altered to "in the army." Chinnock's *Arrian* was not available; but a few passages have been compared with

Robson's Loeb translation, and too the reading of the text of the Godolphin adaptation itself shows that Chinnock's old phraseology has been left essentially the same.

In general then it is clear that Professor Godolphin has properly made corrections in the standard translations, and has introduced many other changes and improvements in word and phrase. But was the game worth the candle? Why alter 'ye' to 'you', and 'thy' to 'your', and 'stage' to 'platform', while leaving unaltered literally countless words and expressions? "These ought ye to have done, and not leave the other undone." Many a reader would prefer to have his Rawlinson and Jowett straight. Nevertheless Professor Godolphin is to be congratulated on this edition, and Random House for adding a fine set to their growing collections of complete works.

G. A. HARRER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination. By JOHN DAY. xi, 300 pages, Columbia University Press, New York 1942 \$3.50

Professor Day has given us the first history of Athens centered primarily upon economic aspects. He is also the first to treat *any* aspect of the city's history from the fifth century B.C. to the fifth century A.D.; or even, as in Day's more detailed chapters, from about 300 B.C. to about A.D. 300. It was a task which required courage, energy, and (not least) judgment in adopting limitations. The limitations are real and will require discussion, but without them there might be no book. Particularly for formulating a general account of so long a period, for raising pertinent questions of detail, for gathering references, and for summarizing conveniently the works of predecessors, the book deserves praise.

In broadest terms, the story is somewhat as follows. The Peloponnesian War deprived the proud imperial city of a primacy in world markets which it was never to regain, and the crests of subsequent waves of prosperity tended to be successively more dependent on the wills of other powers. A high level of prosperity in the fourth century was prolonged, despite Macedonians and inflation, into the first third of the third century, but it had become a fragile prosperity already before Macedon seized and held Athens for the middle third of the century (263-29 B.C.). Foreign domination was assisted by adverse prices; that generation was one of the lowest periods in Athenian history. Freedom (qualified by a quietist pro-Roman policy) and a splendid New Coinage in 229 were the basis and the symbol of a new wave of prosperity which was to mount, especially after Delos was given to Athens in 166, until fifty years later the Himyarites of southern Arabia are

imitating Athenian coinage—one testimony among several to the skill and probity which had kept that coinage sound, as well as to the extent and repute of Athenian commerce. From Sulla's siege and pillage in 86 B.C., the city recovered partially and spasmodically, before Augustus restored her well-being. The rest of the first century after Christ was a period of mild depression. The sunshine of imperial favor under the Five Good Emperors, especially Hadrian, caused Athens to flourish in the second century, and conditions in the third century were still as good as they could be, in the absence of special imperial grants, down to A.D. 267. The Heruli left behind them a city which only began to recover under Constantine's care, especially for the University. The years ca. 350-96 A.D. were the last period of prosperity; decline continued in the fifth century and in A.D. 529 Athens ceased even to be a University town. For nearly a millennium, the possession of philosophy (with all else that the University contained) and of the Eleusinian Mysteries had put money in the wallets of Athenians.

So much for the general outline, which I believe to be substantially correct. Proceeding beyond this, we encounter the limitations of plan which enabled so much matter to be compressed into so few pages. The Economic History paid a price for its own economies. In the first place, except for a page (6-7) on the Attic plains, a few similar incidental references elsewhere, and an agnostic appendix on population, there is no survey of what Athens had to start with, i.e. what the history is of. General references should at least have been supplied, even if special research on such topics as e.g. the degree of forestation could not be attempted. It would have been easy to find out that in rebuilding the stadium, Herodes Atticus did *not* exhaust the quarries on Mt. Pentelikon (Pausanias; Day 197, 204), which incidentally provided marble for an admirably exact reconstruction, following the plan of Herodes' work in precise detail, for the Olympic games of 1896: the best piece of reconstruction in modern Athens, and a fine monument to the most conspicuous figure in Day's book. Until quite recently a Scotch operator was still quarrying profitably in Mt. Pentelikon, which is practically solid marble. A visit to Attica would have been necessary to establish many facts: thus Day rightly believes that lead, an important metal in ancient times, was produced at Laurion (23, n. 126), but proof positive exists in the form of an ancient pig of lead in the collection of mining antiquities brought together by the engineer Dr. Pediani at Laurion.

The human element too might well have been treated in an introductory or a summary chapter. There is a strange absence of real feeling for Athens as a city different from other cities. Let that pass: the question should have been asked, What sort of an economic

organism was Athens?¹ Day finds that the lowest free classes were badly off in each successive period, the farmers did well only at rare intervals, while the rich got fewer and richer, until concentration of wealth reached a peak in the fortune of Herodes Atticus; where middle classes might have continued to exist, there were few or none (105). It is a simple picture, perhaps too easily sketched. Who were the people who furnished recruits for the ephebate to the number of several score, sometimes well over 100, in the late second century B.C. and in succeeding centuries? They were too many to have been representatives of a narrow oligarchy, and the training was too expensive, at least in time, and probably in money also, to be afforded by poor folks. Again, who were the *boulentai*? Each year the constitution called for 500 or 600 or even 650 men who should spend many days managing the city's business in Athens. To be sure, they were paid; but it is equally sure that they were not illiterate peasants. That the required number were actually found in most years (if not in all) is strongly suggested by the scores of inscriptions in honor of prytaneis, and by the study of some 2000 surviving names of prytaneis (Hesperia, Supplement I). It was particularly notable that among those 2000 names, there were hardly any attested instances of second tenure, which the constitution permitted. Altogether the ephebe and (though Day fails to consider them) the prytany inscriptions point to a large and flourishing middle class. To call them "bourgeoisie" (54, *cleruchs*) seems to me to import a host of modern connotations into a sphere where such connotations may have no place. For one thing, ancient society lacked any very large class of professional men: the whole group of highly trained engineers, architects, and others whom the Machine Age has created were unknown to them.² The Athenians of this class, at their worst, set a high value on glory; at their best, they may well be the sort of people who gave Herakleides the Critic the impression that Athenians were notably "magnanimous, simple in their manners, reliable custodians of friendship"; and who in Paul's day "spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing" (Acts 17:21).

It may have been a necessary limitation, but it was an unhappy one, which largely excluded consideration of the city's finances and financial officials (cf. 163). Day speaks merely of the "budgetary system" as inadequate (36, 54, 89-90, 107; index incomplete on this). The phrase is misleading: there was no budget whatever in anything like our sense of the word: see now

¹In this matter of social classes, and in other connections, some mention, however critical, should have been made of J. Hasebroek, *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*, (Eng. trans., London 1933).

²For some sociological data on two families of Athenian professional men in the period after Aristotle, see S. Dow, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 12 (1942) 18-26.

H. Michell, *op. cit. infra*, 355. Doubtless the state's finances could have been, according to our standards, better handled; but because some leading citizens subscribed money for repairing "the [missing] and the tower" (I.G., II² 2331), Day hastily exclaims (36) that "The state treasury could not even maintain the defenses of the city!" Perhaps; but even in the generation after its all-time low, the city was minting tetradrachmai so fast that Flamininus could make off with 84,000 of them (=56 talents; 35). Day is not alone in maintaining that subscriptions (*ἐπιδόσεις*) such as those listed in I.G. II² 2331 of 172/1 B.C. and 2332 of 183/2 B.C. were involuntary (12, 31, 36). Certainly some compulsion was exercised later, ca. 100 B.C. (HSCPh 51 [1940], 111-24=I.G., II² 2336; which records subscriptions for a Pythais, the first payments being in 103/2, *not* the despatch of the expedition, as Day says on page 117—one of his few downright errors). From Athens there is little or no positive evidence, one way or the other, earlier than this. Now I.G., II² 2332 of 183/2 B.C. is a list of some 358 subscribers. The amounts are small, most commonly five or ten drachmai each. The list is headed as was customary by a few distinguished names; there follow a host of unknown men, many of them contributing not only on behalf of themselves but also on behalf of wives, children, parents. The number of donors, the petty sizes of the donations, and especially the presence of the relatives, makes it unlikely that Day (36) would have put this list down as an instance of a compulsory subscription, *if* he had not read so somewhere. Beyond any reasonable doubt, the real motive force was not compulsion but fame—the desire to see one's name on marble. This was a motive which appears as more and more unblushingly explicit in hundreds of Hellenistic inscriptions. Surely we have here in I.G., II² 2332 not a circle of oligarchs paying under compulsion, but middle class citizens full of "public spirit."

Day advances comparatively few novel interpretations of his own. In the Hellenistic chapters, the most ambitious such interpretation concerns the greatest donors of the period, viz. the Attalids and Seleucids and all the others who lavished fortunes on Athens for public works (37-45; others collected in n. 245 on page 90). Their motive, according to Day, was not sentiment—neither a desire for glory nor for support at home—but rather a desire to gain Athenian trade. Just how building a stoa would induce people to trade with the donor's country, unless *they* were influenced by mere sentiment (i.e. by gratitude), is not explained. As Day is aware (100), Athens seems to have been dominated from the middle third century down to the end of the second century B.C., not by grain buyers but by big land-holders, especially in the Mesogaia. It is far from certain that most of the influential Athenians had any interest in grain shipments: here particularly Hasebroeck

should have been considered. There was trade, and probably the monarchs were interested in it; but if that had been their prime object, surely the money that went to Athens could better have been spent in Piraeus or elsewhere on ships, docks, warehouses, and perhaps bribes. In writing an economic history, it is natural to look for economic motives, but for some at least of the first-century B.C. donors, such as Pompey (? pages 145-9 have an interesting discussion of I.G., II² 1035), Antony (who gave islands), and Agrippa (or whoever gave the Agrippeion-Odeion), no economic motive can be thought of. These donations Day does not explain. It is unlikely, moreover, that one of the most enthusiastic Philathenians of the second century, Ariarathes V, was much concerned with trade: Cappadocian commercial interests in Athens seem never to be heard of.³ This being so, we may well think once more of the motive originally suggested by Ferguson, which explains all the facts. In monarchs as well as in Athenian five-drachmai donors, the thirst for prestige dominated, and in the Hellenistic world (which requires understanding) prestige was to be had in and through the city of philosophy.—In Roman emperors, beginning with Caesar and his and Augustus' market, the desire for prestige was doubtless mingled with an economic motive different from that attributed to the Attalids. The Attalids wanted (according to Day's theory) trade with Pergamon; the Emperors aimed at the well-being of the empire, including (in the present connection) Athens primarily.

It is at once a strength and a limitation of the book that it is based largely on the work of predecessors: a strength, in that the first half could be founded on Ferguson's Hellenistic Athens, and the account of the first two centuries of the Empire could draw on Graindor's works. Larsen's Survey and Rostovtzeff's two Economic and Social Histories were available; F. M. Heichelheim's *Wirtschaftsgeschichte* is cited, but H. Michell's *Economic History of Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, University Press, 1940) was too recent; and among more restricted studies, Roussel's and the excavators' on Delos, and all the Agora material published in Hesperia, except Oliver's Sacred Gerusia (*Hesperia*, Supplement VI 1941) and his very recent articles. There was a mass of reading to do, and Day did his homework, culling from Thompson's Hellenistic Pottery and works on later pottery much helpful data (e.g., the long notes 284 on page 96, and 286-8 on pages 165-6); from Reinmuth and his own studies statistics on ephebes; from Miss Grace's Amphora Handles new facts on the wine trade; a multitude of items from Shear's prelim-

³In this general connection there should be mentioned, at least, such monuments as the statue on Helicon of Arsinoe perched on an ostrich (Paus. 9.31.1), and particularly the temple of Zeus on the mountain west of Lebedela, toward which Antiochus IV evidently contributed (Paus. 9.39.4; Ditt., *Syll.* 3, no. 972). Was this trade?

inary reports on the Agora; and, perhaps most important of all in the end, the data from Mrs. Shear's summaries of coins. I suspect that Westermann is responsible for stray bits of knowledge in papyri, as well as for guidance as to slavery, which does not loom as a major factor except at Laurion. From IG II¹ and III¹ Day compiled patiently the totals of foreign ethnics on sepulchral and other monuments; unluckily the new edition of the sepulchral inscriptions was not available. In other classes of inscriptions also he read widely: the study (221-35) of IG II² 2776 is notable. Inscriptiones Graecae and many other epigraphical works are omitted from the (hasty?) Bibliography, which also lacks A. Andreades, *Tam on The Hellenistic Age*, the Cambridge Ancient History, and all articles except a few.

In the main, however, the mere extent of the reading evidently prevented many detailed original researches. These are what is needed now. By "researches" I mean first of all such solid studies as Larsen's *The Price of Tiles in Delos* (CPh 36 [1941] 155-6; too recent to be cited), likewise Amyx's *An Amphora with a Price Inscription* (Univ. Calif. Pubs. Class. Archaeology 1.8 [1941] 179-206); and even conjectures such as CPh 37 (1942) 311-4 on that mysterious Dies whom Day mentions with a query on pages 82 and 116. Research also means thinking, and here too the book could be improved: incidental facts are repeated overmuch, as if the author—quite naturally—had not got entirely outside his wide readings.

The author concludes his preface with a prayer that the new domination of Greece may be brief. When the day of liberation comes and some degree of well-being has once again been restored to Athens, it is to be hoped that the excavation of the Roman Agora can proceed once more. Day's book has made that more desirable than ever. His readers will hope that he may participate.

STERLING DOW

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Tübingen und Konstantinopel. Martin Crusius und seine Verhandlungen mit der Griechisch-Orthodoxen Kirche, by GEORGE ELIAS ZACHARIADES. iv, 109 pages. Gerstung & Lehmann, Göttingen 1941 (Schriftenreihe der Deutsch-Griechischen Gesellschaft, Heft 7)

Martin Crusius (Kraus) was professor of classics at the university of Tübingen from 1559 to 1607 as the successor of his great teacher Philipp Melancthon. Like him Crusius too cultivated humanistic and ecclesiastical interests, but in another way. Time had changed the interests and the tasks. There were no further questions of faith to be formulated. It was the period of the counter-reformation, the protestant church looked about for allies, and a small circle of humanistic dream-

ers thought they might find them within the Greek church. They believed in the compatibility of the fundamental principles of this oldest church and the protestant one, and in the possibility of their unification. So, protestantism should be confirmed against catholicism as representing the very truth of Christianity. A personal connection with the patriarch of Constantinople and other dignitaries of the Greek church was arranged by Greek priests and scientists who went through the Christian countries collecting for the redemption of their brethren from the Turkish yoke and for the support of their churches. In Germany Tübingen was the centre of these efforts, and Crusius was their leader. With these interests he joined those for the language, the culture, and the history of the modern Greeks.

His works in the field of classics were not of such value as to guarantee him a place in the history of this science: a Greek grammar which could not compete with Melancthon's famous *Institutiones Graecae grammaticae*, and editions of Greek authors which, indeed, showed a zeal to gain better readings out of manuscripts. But it characterizes him, too, that sitting in the church, listening to a sermon, he would translate it at once into Greek, and he left behind him twenty volumes of such translations. The German humanism of that time!

Beside him lecturing was a man of much greater importance, his former pupil Nicodemus Frischlin, with whom, up to the tragic end of the younger man, he was at bitter war. This feud did more to preserve his memory than his scientific work did. It found a literary monument in Frischlin's biography written by no less a man than David Friderich Strauss (the author of two once very famous books, *Life of Jesus* and *The Old and the New Faith*). Nevertheless Crusius was right to call himself *φιλέλλην εἶπες τις ἄλλος*, and that in a wider than merely scholastic sense. Indeed, it is to his credit that he anticipated the idea that features of the old Greek language and culture might live on and be used for a better understanding of the ancient ones.

Evidences of these interests are two volumes, *Turcograecia* (1584) and *Germano-Graecia* (1585). But this is only the minor part of what he left; the major part is preserved in manuscript in the Tübingen library comprising under various titles Byzantine history from 1573 to 1605. Its value is indicated by the fact that since 1927 this literary heritage has begun to be edited, until now two volumes, by Wilhelm Goetz and Ernst Conrad, covering the years 1596-1599. A note in our booklet informs us that a third volume is in preparation. The two published volumes are not accessible to me so that I am not able to state of what value they might be for classical interests. It can be supposed that, besides information about manuscripts in which Crusius was deeply interested, they touch only Byzantine interests for which they cannot be of little value because his

knowledge is based mostly on letters which he exchanged with leading men of the Greek church, chiefly in Constantinople, during four decades.

The book of Mr. Zachariades is devoted to questions which do not belong to the interests of CLASSICAL WEEKLY. For this reason I regret not being able to say more of its contents. That it deserves consideration of all who are interested in this subject, is evident. And the foreign relations with Byzantine Greeks in the political, the ecclesiastical and the scientific field, will certainly be, to some degree, of interest for those, too, who are devoted to humanistic studies. From this point of view this publication merits attention and appreciation also.

The author is a Greek, until recently at the Greek Theological School, Pomfret Center, Connecticut. He began his work as a student at the University of Chicago under the leadership of Professor McNeill, continuing it at Tübingen under many German scholars. It is written in German and forms part of the series "Schriften der Deutsch-Griechischen Gesellschaft." It was published in 1941. Already today, this sounds almost like a fairy-tale.

EUGEN TAEUBLER

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Selections Illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics with an English Translation by IVOR THOMAS in two volumes. II. x, 683 pages. Harvard University Press, Cambridge; William Heinemann, London 1941 (Loeb Classical Library) \$2.50

The editors of the Loeb Classical Library are to be commended for rounding out the scope of the series with such volumes as this. The vast field of the ancient pure and technical sciences has too generally been the private domain of a few specialists who were able and willing to study the Greek texts. Whether or not we agree with Dr. Sarton's contention that the history of science rightfully belongs to students whose major training has been in the sciences and not in the humanities and philology, it must be admitted that the number of scientists and technologists who are genuinely interested in and are making significant contributions to the history of their fields is rapidly increasing. As a result of the exigencies of the present war the pace will probably be accelerated. Those students who lack the requisite training to work with original texts await volumes on such subjects in the Loeb series with intense eagerness.

Mr. Thomas has performed an arduous task with great care. He has taken pains in choosing selections and by judiciously curtailing his excerpts has compressed into two volumes an astonishingly large and representative amount of material from the broad field

of Greek mathematics. Each chapter is prefaced by or contains selections of biographical or bibliographical interest, and the annotations are adequate. Volume II opens with excerpts from Aristarchus' *On the Sizes and Distances of the Sun and Moon*. There follow selections from all Archimedes' extant works (including the Heiberg fragments) with the exception of his *Measurement of a Circle*. The next chapter contains the description, as given by Cleomedes, of the method used by Eratosthenes in determining the measurement of the earth's circumference. Then a chapter of selections from Apollonius' famous work *On the Conic Sections* follows. Next we find a chapter on *Later Developments in Geometry*, selections drawn mainly from Proclus' commentary on Euclid. Here is included Cleomedes' truly remarkable explanation of the sun's appearance during lunar eclipses. He attributed it to refraction of the sun's light as it passes through the atmosphere. Unfortunately the familiar analogy of objects immersed in water is missing from this excerpt. The chapter on trigonometry comprises selections drawn from Ptolemy's *Syntaxis*. A chapter on mensuration contains for the most part selections from Heron's *Metrika*, *Dioptra*, and *Geometrika*. Propositions taken from Diophantus' *Arithmetica* form the chapter on algebra, and the volume is concluded with a chapter on the *Revival of Geometry*, consisting of selections from Pappus' *Collection*. There is a valuable glossary and index of Greek mathematical terms at the back.

In this volume the translator continues to lean heavily upon the authority of Sir Thomas Heath, a practice which is at times open to question. In a note on page 8 the fact that Aristarchus is known to have achieved the nearly correct figure of $\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ for the angular diameter of the sun and moon is offered as proof that his work *On the Sizes and Distances of the Sun and Moon* with its estimate of 2° was an earlier work. But it is hard to believe that an investigator of the caliber of Aristarchus could have arrived at so excessive a figure as 2° celestial arc for the sun's apparent diameter from observation. Accordingly that part of Tannery's explanation which suggests that Aristarchus set up this arbitrary figure with no regard for its accuracy still seems quite plausible. On page 272n. it might have been well to give the figures of Lehmann-Haupt (Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, R. E., "Stadion" and Thalamos (Géogr. d'Eratosthène, 158-9) for the stade used by Eratosthenes as well as the Tannery-Heath figure since this problem has not been settled to the satisfaction of many scholars.

It is reassuring in these days of confused avowals of war aims to read the words "Printed in Great Britain" on this volume. The nature of the project, the carefulness of the printing, and the excellence of the diagrams are a tacit yet vociferous tribute to a gallant nation.

WILLIAM H. STAHL

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

Microfilm or photostat copies of articles abstracted may be obtained through Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The charge for a microfilm copy of any periodical article, regardless of length, is 50c; film copying from books and serials is at the rate of 50c for each 50 pages or fraction thereof. Photostat charges are 10c per page, with a minimum charge of 50c for each item. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

ANCIENT AUTHORS

Aeschylus. W. M. EDWARDS. *Agamemnon* 767 f. A proposal to read τ' ἴταν for the corrupt τε τὸν of the manuscripts; (cf. Ar. Clouds 445 and Plato, Symp. 203d.). Τοκεῦσιν is used in the sense of 'ancestors,' as in Pind. Pyth. 4.198.

CR 56 (1942) 71 (F. Jones)

— H. J. ROSE. *Agamemnon* 1091. A proposal to read αὐτόφωνα κακὰ κακάρτανα 'mischief of kindred slaughter, mischief of nooses.' Though the adjective κακάρτανος is not elsewhere attested, it is a legitimate formation and could easily have become corrupted to καρτάναι of the manuscripts.

CR 56 (1942) 71 (F. Jones)

— Persae 419. θάλασσα . . . ἰδεῖν should present no difficulty, for the construction of the nominative with the infinitive, though uncommon, is perfectly classical. (The correspondent who raised the question in CR 56.2 replies that he is not satisfied with Rose's explanation.)

CR 56 (1942) 71-2 (F. Jones)

— GEORGE THOMSON. *Agamemnon* 487 (481). Campbell's conjecture of κενούς for νέους should be accepted. The corruption arose from a gloss on κενούς which had been misspelled καινοῖς because of identity of pronunciation.

CR 56 (1942) 71 (F. Jones)

— Choephoroe 892 (893). To support the emendation φίλατ' Αἰγισθος. βία Thomson, in his edition of the Oresteia (2.235) was able to give no authority for the combination of the vocative of the adjective with the nominative of the noun. There seems clearly to be another example, however, in Scol. Anon. 8 (Diehl, 2.185), where φίλατ' Ἀρμόδιος must be read instead of the unmetrical φίλατ' Ἀρμόδιε of the manuscript.

CR 56 (1942) 71 (F. Jones)

Apollonius Tyanensis. M. A. KOOPS. *Quaeritus, quid significaverit MNHMOCYNH apud Apollonium Tyanensem.* Philostratus reports (1.14) that Apollonius of Tyana composed a hymn to Mnemosyne. Arguing that Apollonius was imbued with Persian lore, R. Meyer-Krämer thought that the reference was to an encomium on the Magian tradition ("Priestertradition"). Koops finds a tribute to the faculty of memory more plausible and supports his view with Pythagorean and other contemporary parallels.

Mn 9 (1940) 101-4 (Plumpe)

Archilochus. F. H. SANDBACH. ΑΚΡΑ ΓΥΡΕΩΝ *Once More.* The reading ἄκρα Γυρέων in Archilochus, fr. 56 Diehl, is correct and has additional support from Dindorf's and Schneidewin's emendation of Cic. ad Atticum 5.12.1: omnia ἄκρα Γυρέων pura. Cicero very probably placed them on the island of Tenos. Travelers' description of storm clouds on Mt. Kyknias help

to explain Archilochus' allusion.

CR 56 (1942) 63-5

(F. Jones)

Aristotle. W. B. STANFORD. *On Poetics* xx. 1457a 22. Aristotle is discussing words whose meanings depend upon the tone with which they are pronounced, and he gives two examples (which appear in the manuscripts with considerable variation). The first, ἰβάδιεν, can be either affirmative or interrogative; as a second example, however, neither ἰβάδιζε or βαδιζει adds anything to the first, while βαδιζει, which most of the editors adopt, can only be imperative. βαδιζετε would give the needed ambiguity, since it can be imperative, affirmative, or interrogative.

CR 56 (1942) 72

(F. Jones)

Polybius. MATTHIAS GELZER. *Die hellenische ΠΡΟΚΑΤΑΣΚΕΥΗ im zweiten Buche des Polybios.* The repetition of the Greek introduction reveals a later addition, and 2.1 belongs properly directly after 1.3. Judging by the context, we see that Polybius adapted a much older set of notes. In treating the acme of the Achaean League, when it united all the Peloponnesus, Polybius writes more than once as if of the present time. Such passages must have been written before the outbreak of the war with Sparta in 148 and the dissolution of the League in 146, and after the war with Perseus in 168. The conclusion drawn is that Polybius started with a history of the Achaeans, which was later expanded into a universal history with its scope limited by events connected with the history of the Achaean League.

H 75 (1940) 27-37

(Kirk)

LINGUISTICS. GRAMMAR. METRICS

BRITAIN, F. *A French Broadsheet of 1582 on Latin Pronunciation.* A unique French broadsheet in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge, *Brief advertisement touchant la prononciation latine d'aucuns mots*, by Hercules Castilliar, briefly described and analyzed, confirms two previous conclusions (F. Britain, *Latin in Church*, Cambridge, 1934) of the author: (1) the pronunciation of Latin as though it were the vernacular cannot be regarded as a deliberate Protestant invention to obliterate an alleged universal pronunciation of ecclesiastical Latin; (2) until modern times the normal practice in any country was to pronounce Latin, both ecclesiastically and academically, on the same principles as the vernacular.

CR 56 (1942) 20-1

(Armstrong)

GONDA, J. *Lat. Faveo utre.* New material to support linking *faveo* as well as *foveo* with Skt. *bhāvayati*, causative of the root *bhu-*. In the causative sense *faveo* originally probably meant "einem oder etw. Stärkung herbeiführen, stärken."

Mn 9 (1940) 112-28

(Plumpe)

HARRISON, E. *Attic ῥ and ῥN, 'I was.'* Evidence indicates that ῥ is the older of the forms in Attic; in most instances it will serve in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Aristophanes. But with Euripides it is far otherwise. Examination of all relevant instances reveals a few places where ῥ is preferable but involves slight changes in text; twenty passages where either form will serve, and six where the manuscripts give ῥN and cannot easily be changed. The inference is that Euripides used both ῥ and ῥN; ῥ before consonants, ῥN before vowels, but on the evidence the only safe conclusion is that he used ῥN of the first person; a similar use of ῥ is not proved.

CR 56 (1942) 6-9

(Armstrong)